

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 SANDRA L. KINNEY, *et al.*,

No. C-12-4477 EMC

9 Plaintiffs,

RELATED TO

10 v.

No. C-12-4478 EMC

11 BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, *et*
12 *al.*,

No. C-12-4615 EMC

No. C-12-4616 EMC

No. C-12-4617 EMC

No. C-12-4619 EMC

No. C-12-4633 EMC

No. C-12-4641 EMC

No. C-12-4642 EMC

No. C-12-4803 EMC

13 Defendants.
14 _____/

15 AND ALL RELATED ACTIONS.
16 _____/

**ORDER STAYING LITIGATION
PENDING DECISION BY MDL
JUDICIAL PANEL RE CONDITIONAL
TRANSFER ORDER**

17
18
19
20 Currently pending before the Court is a motion to stay filed by Defendants Bristol-Myers
21 Squibb Co., Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC, Sanofi US Services Inc., and Sanofi-Synthelabo Inc.
22 (collectively, “Defendants”). Defendants have filed this motion to stay in not only the *Kinney* case
23 identified above but also in nine other cases that have been related to it or to the earlier *Caouette*
24 case over which this Court presided. Defendants have asked the Court to stay proceedings in these
25 cases pending a decision by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation as to whether the cases –
26 currently subject to a conditional transfer order – should be part of the Plavix MDL (MDL No.
27 2418) or remain with the Northern District of California.
28

1 For the reasons stated on the record at the April 11, 2013 hearing herein and for the reasons
2 stated by Judges Seeborg, Illston, and Henderson in their respective cases (*Aiken*, No. C-12-5208
3 RS; *Vanny*, No. C-12-5752 SI ; and *Arnold*, No. C-12-6426 TEH), the Court agrees that a stay is
4 warranted. A stay will not prejudice Plaintiffs as a remand motion can just as easily be presented to
5 and decided by the transferee judge, especially where as here, the remand motion turns on, not on a
6 unique issue of state law, but instead on a question of federal law – *i.e.*, whether the claims against
7 McKesson are preempted. Moreover, a stay likely would not last long; the parties anticipate the
8 conditional transfer issue will be decided shortly after May 30, 2013. Finally, the Court agrees with
9 Judges Seeborg and Illston that “the MDL Panel’s initial concern with transfer is not the motion to
10 remand, as plaintiffs have suggested, but an issue involving CAFA, which has since been resolved.”
11 *Vanny*, No. C-12-5752 SI (Docket No. 32) (Order at 3).

12 Accordingly, the Court hereby stays proceedings in the above-referenced cases until further
13 order of the Court.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16
17 Dated: April 12, 2013



18
19 EDWARD M. CHEN
20 United States District Judge
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28